

## REMARKS

### Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-8 and 10 are considered in the Office Action.

Claims 1-8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Battat et al U.S. Patent No. 5,958,012 (“Battat”) in view of Matoba U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0048034 (“Matoba”).

### Reply to §103(a) Rejections

Applicants have amended claim 1 to more particularly describe and distinctly claim the invention, and have cancelled claim 10. Amended claim 1 recites a printing system comprising a network, a plurality of output printing devices coupled to the network, each output printing device comprising status information, a client computer coupled to the network, and an application adapted to run on the client computer, wherein the application is adapted to submit a first print job to a first output printing device and a second print job to a second output printing device, receive the status information regarding the output printing devices, determine which of the received status information is relevant to the first and second print jobs, filter the status information to extract the status information relevant to the first and second print jobs, and group and display the filtered status information regarding the first and second output printing devices. Support for the claim amendments may be found at least at page 4, lines 23-26, page 5, lines 7-12, page 9, lines 4-7, page 13, lines 23-27, page 15, lines 10-14, page 16, lines 4-19, page 20, lines 3-7, page 22, lines 28-30, page 26, line 32 through page 27, line 11.

Neither of the cited references, alone or combined, describe or suggest the claimed invention. Indeed, Battat nowhere describes or suggests anything regarding an application adapted to run on a client computer, wherein the application is adapted to submit a first print job to a first output printing device and a second print job to a second output printing device, receive the status information regarding the output printing devices, determine which of the received status information is relevant to the first and second print jobs, filter the status information to extract the status information

relevant to the first and second print jobs, and group and display the filtered status information regarding the first and second output printing devices.

The Office action at 2 asserts that Battat describes an application adapted to receive status information regarding all of the output printing devices, filtering status information submitted by a client computer and display the filtered status information. As support for this assertion, the Office action cites col. 1, lines 48-67, col. 5, lines 27-39 and col. 6, lines 2-26. Although the cited portions variously refer to “status” and “status information,” and “filter,” none of the cited portions describe or suggest anything regarding an application adapted to (1) run on a client computer, (2) submit a first print job to a first output printing device and a second print job to a second output printing device, (3) receive the status information regarding the output printing devices, (4) determine which of the received status information is relevant to the first and second print jobs, (5) filter the status information to extract the status information relevant to the first and second print jobs, and (6) group and display the filtered status information regarding the first and second output printing devices.

Matoba also does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. Matoba describes a system in which a host computer 1 generates a command for a status response from a printer 2. ¶¶0223-0225. In particular, host computer 1 includes a printing out administration portion 11, which issues a command for status, which is sent to printer 2. ¶¶0471-0475. Printer 2 includes a status response processing portion 7, which prepares a status response, which is then transmitted by data transmission administration portion 9 to host computer 1. ¶¶0241-0245. Printing out administration portion 11 determines if the received status response pertains to the job being processed. ¶¶0484-0485. If the status response pertains to the current job or pertains to all jobs, it is used, otherwise, the status response is ignored. ¶¶0484-0485, 0557, 00582, 0593, 0616-0619, 0640-0641.

Unlike the claimed invention, however, Matoba does not describe or suggest an application adapted to (1) run on a client computer, (2) submit a first print job to a first output printing device and a second print job to a second output printing device, (3) receive the status information regarding the output printing devices, (4) determine which of the received status information is relevant to the first and second print jobs, (5) filter the status information to extract the status information relevant to the first and

second print jobs, and (6) group and display the filtered status information regarding the first and second output printing devices.

Indeed, Matoba does not describe or suggest anything regarding a client application that submits print jobs to two different output printing devices, receives and processes status information from multiple output printing devices, filters status information from multiple output printing devices to extract the status information relevant to multiple print jobs, or group and display the filtered status information regarding the first and second output printing devices.


Further, the combination of Battat and Matoba, even if possible, would not produce the claimed invention. Battat describes a network management system that allows a network administrator to manage a networked computer system, and to see status and configuration of network components. Matoba describes a printing system in which status information is collected for specific print jobs, while ignoring status information pertaining to other specific print jobs. The combination of Battat and Matoba would seemingly be a network management system in which print status information is collected for specific print jobs, while print status information pertaining to other specific print jobs is ignored.

Because neither Battat nor Matoba, alone or combined, describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of amended claim 1 be withdrawn. Because all other claims depend from claim 1, applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2-8 also be withdrawn.

### Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-8, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James Trosino  
Registration No. 39,862  
Attorney for Applicants